DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 113 EA 018 950

AUTHOR Lynch, David M.; And Others
TITLE Leadership in the Liberal Arts: A Study of the Concerns and Job Experiences of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Deans; *College Administration; Educational Quality; *Educational Trends; Employment Practices; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Human Resources; *Job Satisfaction; Leadership Responsibility; *Liberal Arts; Occupational Surveys; Performance Factors; *Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Through a 1984 nationwide random sample of 371 chief liberal arts academic officers, this study examines respondents' careers and administrative behavior and their reports about the condition of the liberal arts in their institutions. The study describes grants administration, evaluation mechanisms, satisfactions and frustrations, and career success of chief liberal arts academic officers. The sample includes all levels and types of degree-granting institutions. Six appended tables summarize survey results. In spite of competition for resources with other academic units (whose enrollments are expanding, whereas those in the liberal arts are declining) and calls for improved quality, chief liberal arts officers have positive feelings about their institutions. Sixty-nine precent, however, plan to return to teaching and research or to advance in administration. Limitations in budgets and time bring frustration, but job satisfaction comes from informal work with faculty, administration, and program development. Views of career and salary success are low considering leadership status. Large public institutions offer the highest salaries, whereas high personal educational impact is most often present in smaller private undergraduate institutions. Leaders of the liberal arts are not adequately empowered to meet challenges unless they can compensate for limited formal power by effective use of consensus-building mechanisms. Twenty-seven references are included. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276113

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David M. Lynch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

LEADERSHIP IN THE LIBERAL ARTS: A STUDY OF THE CONCERNS AND JOB EXPERIENCES OF CHIEF LIBERAL ARTS ACADEMIC OFFICERS

by:

David M. Lynch
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Lee H. Bowker
Augustana College

J. Richard McFerron
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986

EA 018 950

ABSTRACT

The careers and administrative behavior of chief liberal arts academic officers are examined based on a national survey conducted during 1984. The paper is based on the conviction that the quality of teaching in higher education is significantly influenced by the administrative behavior of department chairs, deans, and chief academic officers. Specifically, the study describes grants administration, evaluation mechanisms, satisfactions and frustrations, and career success of chief liberal arts academic officers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank William England, Tim Gustafson, Leslie Mosley, Diane Gift, Nance Ritsko, and Steven Holt for their help with data analysis. Donna Mihalik and Coleen Seagren were most helpful in manuscript production. Funding for this research was provided by the Institute for Advanced Research, a unit of the Graduate School at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

LEADERSHIP IN THE LIBERAL ARTS: A STUDY OF THE CAREERS AND JOB EXPERIENCES OF CHIEF LIBERAL ARTS ACADEMIC OFFICERS

A series of recent national reports suggests that the condition of the liberal arts in American colleges and universities is less than good. Although the causes and proposed remedies are complex and divergent, one aspect that has received some attention is the role of academic leaders in stimulating a restoration of the liberal arts. The National Institute of Education (1984) and the Association of American Colleges (1985) reflect this perspective. For example, the NIE's report Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education, suggests that administrators should support quality in teaching through such processes as hiring, promotion, and salaries.

The academic literature reinforces the need for active administrative involvement in improving the liberal arts. Clark Kerr (1984) suggests that the president, provost, and dean must provide leadership in defining the scope of liberal learning, in considering what knowledge is most worth knowing, and in guarding against excessive specialization. Corriher (1964) sets a similar tone in suggesting that one of the prime functions of academic leadership is to balance a faculty reward system in which students have become "little more than irksome distractions" when compared to the publishing activity of faculty.

Although many have studied the deanship generally, limited attention has been given chief liberal arts academic administrators. For example, Dibden (1968), Mobberley and Wicks (1962), and Scott (1979) provide descriptions of the roles of deans generally and liberal arts deans specifically, while Moore et.al. (1983) describe career paths leading to the deanship. Others have

focused on specific aspects of deans' careers and roles, e.g. Rasmussen (1978) on administrative evaluation and Lyle (1963) and Arden (1967) on teaching while serving as dean. Schuh (1975) and Watson and Stevens (1982) note the significance of the relationship between deans and the faculty upon whom they rely for advice and legitimacy. Several frustrations and satisfactions of serving as a dean are described by Ingraham and King (1968).

This paper takes the perspective originally developed by Gould (1964) and most recently applied by Bowker and Lynch in their studies of graduate and continuing education deans. These studies are united in the conviction that the quality of teaching and the quality of higher education are significantly influenced by adminstrative behavior. An important component of this research stream was a series of surveys by the American Sociological Association with support from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the Lilly Endowment. The ASA surveys of 1977 (Bowker, 1978, 1980, 1981, 1984) were carried out under the leadership of Hans Mauksch. Part of this focus was a survey of the deans of academic units in which sociology was taught, i.e. liberal arts deans at most institutions. This survey became the model for the IUP series of surveys of higher education administrators, beginning with graduate deans (Bowker and Lynch, 1984; Lynch and Bowker, 1984) and extending to continuing and adult education deans (Lynch, Kolb and Bowker, 1985). The survey reported in this paper is the fourth in the series beginning in 1977 by the ASA.

METHODOLOGY

This study is unusual in the definition of its sampling frame as chief liberal arts academic officers in the United States and in its subject matter as the professional behavior of the liberal arts administrators and their reports about the condition of the liberal arts in their institutions. Names of chief liberal arts academic officers were obtained from address labels of arts and sciences deans and chief college and university academic affairs officers provided by Peterson's Distribution Services, a program of Peterson's Guides. The labels were organized into a single list of chief liberal arts academic officers by choosing the most appropriate position in each institution according to job title and, when necessary, administrative structure. Institutions in which the liberal arts were minimally present were excluded from the sampling frame. A total of 1,476 chief liberal arts academic officers constituted the final sampling frame, out of which questionnaires were sent to a 50 percent random sample in spring 1984. By the cutoff date for inclusion in the study, 371 of the 738 chief liberal arts academic officers had returned usable questionnaires, for a return rate of slightly over 50 percent.

Data processing was carried out using standard methods of data entry and data verification. Data analysis was accomplished using SPSS^{X} (SPSS Inc., SPSS^{X} User's Guide, 1983). All bivariate correlations reported in the study are tau b, a correlational measure for ordinal data, because many of the variables are ordinal in nature. The comparison of correlations among ordinal and interval or ratio-level variables is facilitated when all correlations are computed using the same formula.

COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE

Sixty-three (17 percent) of the sampled institutions offer doctorates, 163 (44 percent) offer master's and bachelor's degrees, and 145 (39 percent) are undergraduate institutions. Twenty-five percent of the institutions are church-related, 41 percent are independent private institutions, and 34 percent are public colleges and universities. The rural-urban geographical distribution of the institutions is fairly balanced, with 15 percent located in rural environments, 30 percent in small towns, 31 percent in urban environments, and 25 percent in metropolitan areas (the percentages sum 101 due to standard rounding procedures).

A number of the institutional characteristics included in the study are measures of the size of the organization. Sixty-six percent of the institutions employ fewer than 150 full-time equivalent faculty members, 21 percent employ 150-499 FTE faculty, 8 percent employ 500-1,000 FTE faculty, and 4 percent employ more than 1,000 FTE faculty. More than a quarter enroll 1,000 or fewer students and over a third have between 1,001 and 2,500 students. Large institutions are much fewer in number, 29 having 10,001 to 20,000 students and 17 enrolling in excess of 20,000 students. There are no graduate students at 40 percent of the institutions sampled.

FINDINGS

Careers of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Chief liberal arts academic officers have come up through the ranks. Unlike college presidents, they are rarely recruited from outside of the higher education community. The median length of higher education experience was close to 20 years, and a small proportion (12 percent) of the chief liberal arts academic officers had been in higher education for more than 30 years. The median number of years of service at the current institution was close to 11 years, while the median tenure as chief liberal arts academic officer was just under five years. By and large, chief liberal arts academic officers have had extensive experience in higher education.

Fifty-six of the chief liberal arts academic officers were in their first year at their posts, 21 of whom were also new at the institution. This means that most of the promotions were internal rather than the product of external recruitment. If the proportion of respondents reporting no more than one year on the job were consistent over an extended period of time, we could assume a turnover rate of approximately seven years, which is not an excessively high turnover rate for a position with responsibilities of this nature in the field of higher education.

The most common doctoral degree discipline of the chief liberal arts academic officer was in the physical sciences or mathematics. Education was the second most common doctoral degree area. Only after that did the traditional humanities of English (as well as other languages) and history appear. Four out of every five chief liberal arts academic officers

received their doctoral degrees in a liberal arts discipline, but less than half of their doctorates were in the traditional humanities and fine arts. Many of these disciplines were poorly represented among chief liberal arts academic officers. For example, 13 of the respondents received doctorates in philosophy, religion, or theology, one reported a doctorate in medieval studies, four in linguistics, six in music, three in rhetoric, two in American studies, and none in art or art history. The median year for doctoral degree receipt was 1968. When compared with the respondents' length of service in higher education, this implies that a great many of the chief liberal arts academic officers did not receive their doctorates until they had been teaching for a number of years.

Most (61 percent) chief liberal arts academic officers serve in their administrative posts at the pleasure of the president or another administrator beyond their own level, 27 percent receive "automatic" annual contracts, and 8 percent receive contracts for a specific number of years (the most common interval being five years). This limited job security in an administrative role is supplemented by tenured faculty backup positions for the majority (57 percent) of the chief liberal arts academic officers.

Administrative Behavior of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Eighty-eight percent of chief liberal arts academic officers receive advice on matters of academic policy and curriculum from faculty committees. Nearly half of them receive advice on research support for faculty members, and exactly half of the chief liberal arts academic officers in graduate institutions (30 percent of all chief liberal arts academic officers) have a faculty committee that advises them on issues

related to graduate student welfare. The advice they receive from these committees is not taken lightly. Only six administrators followed the advice of their faculty advisory committees less than half the time, and the median acceptance of faculty committee advice was close to 90 percent. When asked to make a qualitative instead of a quantitative judgement about relations with faculty advisory committees, six-sevenths of the chief liberal arts academic officers indicated that faculty advisory committees were either influential (48 percent) or very influential (38 percent) on the general direction of policy in the liberal arts.

Chief liberal arts academic officers are so busy with their administrative responsibilities that it is difficult for them to find time for teaching. Most of them teach either one or two courses per year, a few teach more than one course per semester, and more than a third of these liberal arts administrators never teach at all. Administrative burdens that are usually avoided by chief liberal arts academic administrators include responsibilities for admission to the liberal arts unit, awarding financial aid, and certifying degree completion. These functions are much more likely to be controlled by campus-wide offices than by the chief liberal arts academic officer. Academic department chairs are also more likely than the chief liberal arts academic officer to make decisions on admissions, financial aid, and degree certification, but they are subordinated to campus-wide offices in most colleges and universities. Avoiding these responsibilities is a mixed blessing, since this also means that chief liberal arts academic officers lose some degree of control over academic standards in their units. One area over which chief liberal arts academic officers generally have control is the formulation of due process policies for student grievances. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents reported that they are responsible for student grievance policies.

What do chief liberal arts academic officers do with their professional time? Table 1 contains the mean estimates of actual and ideal time usage by these administrators, along with the ranked positions of the 17 activites from most to least time-consuming. Because extreme values have a disproportionately large statistical effect on the calculation of means, the high proportion of time devoted by a small number of chief liberal arts officers to nearly every activity examined has inflated the mean percentage of time for that activity in the total sample. It is for this reason that the mean proportions of time used for the 17 activities total more than 100 percent. Chief liberal arts academic officers spend more of their professional time in conferences with faculty and other administrators, formal committee meetings, and personnel matters than in any other activities.

The rank-order correlation between actual and ideal time usage by chief liberal arts academic officers is .73, which indicates a substantial correspondence between what the respondents do in their daily routine and what they believe they should be doing in their professional lives. The largest discrepancies between ideal and actual time usage were for personal research, professional reading, curriculum development, and formal committee meetings. Chief liberal arts academic officers felt they did not have enough time for the first three activities, and that formal committee meetings took up too much of their time. Although the largest discrepancy, for personal research, is only 5 percent, it means that chief liberal arts academic officers devote less than a third of the time to personal research that they judge to be proper for someone in their administrative position, roughly one hour instead of three hours per week.

The respondents cited formal committee meetings as taking 40 percent more of their time than they would like to devote to committee work. Table 2 examines their committee participation in greater detail. Chief liberal arts academic officers are most likely to serve on the budget committee (67 percent), the computer resources committee (45 percent), the major equipment committee (36 percent), and the library committee (34 percent). It is not common for them to routinely chair any of these committees. The category of other major committees in Table 2 consists mainly of curriculum committees, councils of deans, academic standards committees, and academic affairs committees.

There is a dilemma in these data. Chief liberal arts academic officers feel they spend too much time in committee meetings, yet they are not well represented on most major committees. It is not unreasonable to argue that these administrators, as major advocates for excellence in higher education, should increase their presence on bodies such as the library committee, the graduate council, and the major equipment committee.

Grants Administration

The president's signature is required on liberal arts grant proposals in most institutions, while the chief liberal arts academic officer has signature authority in less than half the colleges and universities studied. This is another administrative area in which the chief liberal arts academic officer's control over important operations in the liberal arts unit is attentuated in a surprisingly large number of institutions. One positive aspect of the data on grant signature authority is that the chief liberal arts academic officer is more likely than the financial vice

president or another dean (in practice almost always the graduate dean) to have administrative control over external grant proposals.

A related point is that chief liberal arts academic officers administer institutional research support funds within the liberal arts unit in just 52 percent of the institutions. Internal research funding for liberal arts professors is controlled outside of the liberal arts unit in nearly half the cases. We assume that this external control is usually exercised by the graduate dean or a faculty committee under the sponsorship of the graduate school, but there are no data with which to test this assumption because the questionnaire did not probe any further into the area of internal funding for liberal arts faculty research.

Questionnaires present an oversimplified view of reality, even when they are used in complex multivariate analyses of social phenomena. The above discussion of grant authority is an example of this limitation in survey methodology. Signature authority is not the same as administrative control over grants. By tradition, some administrators automatically sign all the grants that come before them. Others sign them only upon the advice of an administrator (perhaps a financial officer or a dean) whose signature does not appear on the grant at all. Does it matter when presidents sign grants if they never do so without the verbal approval of the chief liberal arts academic officer? Questionnaires, as opposed to qualitative methods such as direct observation and in-depth interviewing, reveal the outlines of formal decision-making structures without considering nuances such as institutional tradition, personal trust, and interpersonal dominance.

A second aspect of this same point is that it is very difficult to capture complex decision-making processes in a questionnaire which is

inherently linear and unidimensional at the point at which subjects respond, as well as when the data are entered in the computer for processing. How do we capture data to accurately mirror grant decision-making processes which vary from a single person to committees of different compositions? To model such complexities in a questionnaire would produce a document hundreds of pages long, one that chief liberal arts officers would never have time to fill out. The response rate would plunge to zero.

Evaluating Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Approximately a third of the chief liberal arts academic officers in the sample are never evaluated. Less than half of them receive regular annual evaluations, and a small number are evaluated at intervals of two, three, or four years.

Evaluations generally proceed downward rather than upward. Fifty-eight percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers reported that they were evaluated by presidents or chancellors, and 22 percent indicated that they were evaluated by vice-presidents or provosts. Faculty members became involved in the evaluations of less than a quarter of the chief liberal arts academic officers. Department chairs were even less likely to be consulted. The consumer approach to educational service delivery, now so common in the form of student course evaluations, has not yet reached the chief liberal arts academic administrators in most of the institutions included in the study.

Satisfactions and Frustrations of
Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Respondents were asked to identify their three main job satisfactions and job frustrations. These were then coded into the summary categories that are shown in Tables 3 and 4. The three most important job satisfactions of chief liberal arts academic officers in Table 3 are (1) working with faculty, staff, and administrators, (2) program development, and (3) personal factors. Examples of personal factors cited by the liberal arts administrators are "an atmosphere of informality and relaxation" and "friendships in the community which grew out of the job". Nearly two-thirds of the respondents cited one of these factors as the most satisfying aspect of their job. The order of the job satisfaction is unchanged from the list of the most satisfying single job aspect to the parallel list of the three most important job satisfactions.

The major job frustrations associated with leading the liberal arts academic community are detailed in Table 4. The three factors mentioned most often as the number one job frustration are (1) the budget, (2) time constraints, and an item that was listed as the most important job satisfaction, (3) working with faculty, staff, and administrators. The order is slightly different if we focus on the three most frustrating job aspects instead of the single most frustrating factor. The order of the frustrations ranked (1) and (2) are reversed, and "problems originating in the faculty" moves up into third place.

Career Success of Chief
Liberal Arts Academic Officers

More than one out of every five chief liberal arts academic officers defined his or her current salary as indicating a fairly or very low level of salary success relative to academics of the same age and qualifications. Most thought they were fairly successful (60 percent) or very successful (18 percent) in salary terms. The reports for self-defined career success (reflecting position and status in higher education rather than financial remuneration) were slightly more positive. Twenty-nine percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers believed their careers to be very successful, 56 percent fairly successful, 4 percent fairly unsuccessful, and 12 percent very unsuccessful.

Although these success ratings can hardly be said to be low, they are far lower than one might expect from the national leaders of the liberal arts in higher education. Why is this so? Several reasons that come to mind are the relatively low salaries of administrators relative to many full professors and the status of the liberal arts relative to the professions on many college campuses. Even the best paid chief liberal arts academic officers earn less per hour than many successful professors in departments under their supervision. Administrators often work longer hours than professors, and give up opportunities for consulting, public speaking, and writing textbooks and trade books. Some of them may regret having given up these income and reputation enhancing professional activities in return for their administrative appointments.

It is also possible that perceptions of slippage in liberal arts units on many campuses where they are in direct competition with various

professional schools and departments has affected the chief liberal arts academic officers' definitions of career success. Declining enrollments and resource allocation relative to the professions are the lot of the liberal arts in a great many colleges and universities. Business, medicine, law, nursing, and engineering are powerful competitors for liberal arts faculty and staff positions that become vacant, and the high cost of education in most professional areas drains resources away from program initiatives proposed by the chief liberal arts academic officer. The chief liberal arts academic officer survey unfortunately did not collect data on either of these two hypothesized factors in the definition of career and salary success held by top liberal arts administrators.

Chief liberal arts academic officers were asked about their impact on the quality of education at their institutions. None of the administrators judged that impact to be zero, but just over one in five felt they were able to have an impact on education at the institution to only a limited degree, and just slightly more than a third of the chief liberal arts academic officers reported that they had very much of an impact on the quality of education in their own academic settings. The remaining 44 percent of the liberal arts administrators rated their impact on educational quality as "fairly much."

Chief liberal arts academic officers generally have quite positive feelings about their institutions. Twenty percent found their present institutions to be nearly perfect for them, 58 percent rated their present institutions as "a very good place for me," 19 percent as "a fairly good place for me," and 2 percent as "not a good place for me." As might be expected, there was a significant relationship (tau b = .32) between the administrators' perceptions of their educational impact and their feelings

about their institutions. Administrators who feel they have no more than a limited impact on higher education at their institutions are likely to believe that the organization is no better than a fairly good place for them rather than a very good or a perfect situation for them personally.

Despite relatively high opinions of their present situations, 69 percent of the respondents thought they would probably leave the position of chief liberal arts academic officer at some time in the future, mostly to return to teaching and research (31 percent), or to advance to another administrative position in higher education (43 percent). Many of the remaining respondents hoped to combine teaching, research, and administration in some future position, perhaps with an emphasis on consulting. Only a handful predicted that they would eventually move into private industry.

Table 5 summarizes the distribution of career success, salary success, feelings about the institution, impact on education, and likelihood of resigning across six basic institutional characteristics. Career success, feelings about the institution, and the likelihood of resigning hardly vary at all by institutional type. Salary success and impact on education are significantly related to every variable except the urbanization of the institution's geographical setting. It is surprising to see that relationships between institutional characteristics and salary success are always in the opposite direction from relationships between institutional characteristics and educational impact. High salary success is most likely to be found in large public institutions offering doctorates, while high educational impact is most likely to be found in small to medium-sized private undergraduate institutions. In the total sample, the correlation between salary success and educational impact is exactly zero and the

correlation between career success and educational impact is .05, while the correlation between salary success and career success is .36.

It is important to note that the chief liberal arts academic officer's feelings about the institution are at the same positive level in large universities and small colleges, in rural and urban settings, and in public as well as private institutions of higher education. Table 6 illustrates this conclusion with data about the institutional feelings of chief liberal arts academic officers in private church-related, private independent, and public institutions of higher education. The proportion of administrators reporting that the local institution is very good or nearly perfect for them varied only from 74 percent at public institutions to 81 percent at private independent institutions, which is too small a difference to be statistically or substantively significant.

COMMENTARY

Given the analysis of the careers and administrative behavior of chief liberal arts academic officers, what can be concluded about the life of these administrators in the academy? Chief liberal arts academic officers, as senior academics from some discipline within the liberal arts broadly defined, carry the mantle of academic legitimacy to their jobs. The prevailing mode for decision making has a decidedly traditional flavor directed toward concensus building or at least substantial committee advice. Indeed, most time is spent in conferences with faculty and other administrators, in formal committee meetings, and on personnel matters. At the same time, the formal powers and institutional placement of these individuals reflects some limits on formal authority as noted in the limited appointments to very significant committees and limited authority over internal and external grants. Two sets of countervailing forces, then, converge to limit formal power and authority. Further, evaluation mechanisms, usually proceeding downward rather than upward, are employed for a limited number of individuals and reflect only modest assistance in refining goals, directions, and behaviors.

Given the competition for resources with other academic units (most of which are growing in enrollments while the liberal arts are declining) and calls for improved quality, it might be assumed that chief liberal arts academic officers are a frustrated lot. Limited budgets, time constraints, and some personnel matters do seem to be sources of frustration but job satisfaction comes from working with faculty, staff, and administrators, program development, and personnel factors. Self-reported views of career and salary success are lower than can be reasonably expected for individuals occupying such prominent academic leadership positions.

How, then, within a institutional context of countervaling power and authority, are administrators in the liberal arts able to provide leadership? Willis (1970) and Linnell (1974) are among those who have pointed out that the dean's greatest effect on institutional policy operates more at the informal level than at the level of formal authority. If it is true that the power to persuade faculty and other administrators is applied more frequently than formal power, then we must ask whether this method of operation facilitates long-term policy and program development in a way that serves the liberal arts well. Are the leaders of the liberal arts, individuals central to the calls for reform that have echoed through reports of recent national commissions on higher education, adequately empowered and prepared to meet the challenges of the 1980's and 1990's? We fear not, unless they can compensate for their lack of formal power and authority by the effective use of persuasion and other concensus-building mechanisms.

REFERENCES

Arden, E. (1967). Deans and chairmen in the clasroom. AAUP Bulletin, 53, 236-238.

Association of American Colleges. (1985). Integrity in the college curriculum: A report to the academic community. Washington, D.C.

Bennett, W. J. (1984). To reclaim a legacy: A report on the humanities in higher education. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Bowker, L. H. (1978). Data book on the institutional context of teaching sociology. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

Bowker, L. H. (1980). Process and structure: The institutional context of teaching sociology. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

Bowker, L. H. (1981). The college dean: A case of miscommunication about the importance of teaching. Liberal Education, 67, 319-326.

Bowker, L. H. (1984). Administrative policy and undergraduate education. In F. L. Campbell, H. M. Blalock and R. McGee, Teaching sociology: The quest for excellence, pp. 59-77. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Bowker, L. H. & Lynch, D. M. (1984). The operational importance of teaching. Teaching Sociology, 12, 47-70.

Bowker, L. H., Lynch, D. M. & McFerron, J. R. (1985). The administration of the liberal arts in American colleges and universities. Indiana, PA: Institute for Advanced Research, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Corriher, K. (1964). American leadership and the failure of the humanities in Case studies in the liberal arts college: academic administration, edited by A. Ayers and G. Russel (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (DHEW)).

Dibden, A. J. (1968). The academic deanship in American colleges and universities. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Gould, J. W. (1964). The academic deanship. (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges).

Ingraham, M. H. and F. P. King (1968). The mirror of brass: the compensation and working conditions of college and university administrators. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Kerr, C. (1984). Liberal learning: a record of presidential neglect. Change, September, 1984, 32-36.

Linnell, J. (1974). The academic dean as enables. Liberal Education (60, 3, 368-376).

Lyle, L. L. (1963). Should the dean teach? Liberal Education, 49, 379-383.

Lynch, D. M. & Bowker, L. H. (1984). A national study of graduate deans and graduate education. Council of Graduate Schools Communicator, 17, 6.

Lynch, D. M., Kolb, N. E., & Bowker, L. H. (1985). The question of quality and the role of the dean. Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 33, 2-7.

Mobberley, D. G. and M. F. Wicke (1962). The deanship of the liberal arts college. Nashville, Tennessee: Division of Higher Education, Board of Education, The Methodist Church.

Moore, K. M., A. M. Salimbene, J. D. Marlier, and S. M. Bragg (1983). The structure of presidents' and deans' careers. Journal of Higher Education, 54, 500-515.

Rasmussen, G. R. (1978). Evaluating the academic dean in Developing and evaluating administrative leadership, New directions for higher administration, C. F. Fisher (ed.), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Schuh, J. H. (1975). The decision-making process in liberal arts colleges of large universities. College and University, 20, 2, 177-182.

Scott, R. A. (1979). The "amateur dean" in a complex university: an essay on role ambiguity. (65, 4, 445-452).

SPSS, Inc. (1983). SPSS user's guide. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. (1984). Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Watson, J. M. and R. P. Stevens (1982). Perspectives on liberal education: pioneers and pallbearers. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Willis, J. R. (1970). What does the dean do? College Management (5, 10, 26-27).

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

DAVID M. LYNCH is the Interim Dean of the Graduate School and Research at Indiana University of Pennsylvania and Director of Higher Education Administration Research Projects in the Institute for Advanced Research.

LEE H. BOWKER is Provost and Academic Vice President at Augustana College. He has previously served as the Dean of the Graduate School and Research at Indiana University of Pennsylvania and Associate Dean of the School of Social Welfare at the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee.

J. RICHARD McFERRON is the Assistant Director for Academic Systems and Research in the Information Systems and Communications Center at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Table 1

Relationship Between Actual and Ideal Time Usage by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Activity	Actual Time Usage		Ideal Time Usage	
	Mean Proportion	Rank	Mean Proportion	Rank
Conferences with administrators	13%	3	11%	3.5
Conferences with faculty	13%	3	14%	1.5
Formal committee meetings	14%	1	10%	6
Teaching	7%	10	8%	8.5
Personal Research	2%	16	7%	10.5
Representing unit to external community	5%	11	6%	12.5
Professional travel	4%	12.5	5%	14
Preparing reports	8%	8	6%	12.5
Consulting	3%	14.5	4%	15.5
Professional reading	4%	12.5	7%	10.5
Personnel matters	12%	5	10%	6
Budget	9%	6	8%	8.5
Curriculum development	8%	8	11%	3.5
Support of internally funded research	1%	17	2%	17
Support of grant acquisition	3%	14.5	4%	15.5
Policy development	8%	8	10%	6
Other	13%	3	14%	1.5

Spearman's rho = .73

Table 2

Major Committee Memberships of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer

Major Committees	Member Only		Member and Chair		Total Representation	
	Number of Institutions	Proportion	Number of Institutions	Proportion	Number of Institutions	Proportion
Budget	223	60.1%	26	7.0%	249	67.1%
Library	114	30.7%	13	3.5%	127	34.2%
Major equipment	107	28.8%	26	7.0%	133	35.8%
Graduate council	71	19.1%	31	8.4%	102	27.5%
Computer resources	139	37.5%	29	7.8%	168	45.3%
Research facilities	56	15.1%	17	4.6%	73	19.7%
Human subject protection	33	8.9%	4	1.1%	37	10.0%
Other major committees	72	19.4%	73	19.7%	145	39.1%

Table 3

Major Job Satisfactions of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Major Job Satisfactions	Mentioned As the Most Satisfying Job Aspect		Mentioned As One of the Three Most Satisfying Job Aspects	
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
Working with faculty, staff, and administrators	85	26.0%	210	64.2%
Program development	73	22.3%	176	53.8%
Personal factors	48	14.7%	156	47.7%
Working with students	37	11.3%	105	32.1%
Making decisions	35	10.7%	82	25.1%
Challenge	31	9.5%	60	18.3%
Administration	8	2.4%	51	15.6%
Response to community needs	4	1.2%	24	7.3%
Budget	0	0%	9	2.8%
Other satisfactions	6	1.8%	20	6.1%
Total	327	99.9%[a]	--	--[b]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

[b] Percentages do not sum 100.0 because categories are not based on a single 100.0 percent breakdown.

Table 4

Major Job Frustrations of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Major Job Frustrations	Mentioned As the Most Frustrating Job Aspect		Mentioned As One of the Three Most Frustrating Job Aspects	
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
Budget	74	23.0%	165	51.2%
Time constraints	73	22.7%	178	55.3%
Working with faculty, staff, and administrators	48	14.9%	101	31.4%
Problems originating in the faculty	42	13.0%	115	35.7%
Making decisions	31	9.6%	67	20.8%
Administration	20	6.2%	71	22.0%
Personal factors	16	5.0%	53	16.4%
Working with students	6	1.9%	25	7.8%
Low perception of the value of liberal arts by others	4	1.2%	14	4.3%
Program development	1	0.3%	16	5.0%
Other	7	2.2%	27	8.4%
Total	322	100.0%	—	--[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 because categories are not based on a single 100.0 percent breakdown.

Table 5

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Careers of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers[a]

Career Variables	Institutional Characteristics					
	Highest Degree Offered	Private/ Public	Rural/ Urban	Faculty Size	Total Student Body	Graduate Student Body
Career success	.09*	.05	-.01	.07	.06	.11*
Salary success	.21***	.13**	.03	.21***	.21***	.20***
Feelings about the institution	-.02	-.08	.02	-.02	-.02	-.04
Impact on education	-.09*	-.11**	-.06	-.12**	-.19***	-.13**
Likely to resign	.02	.04	.00	.00	.03	.01

[a] All correlations are tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05

** Statistically significant at less than .01

***Statistically significant at less than .001

Table 6

Relationship Between Institutional Sponsorship and the Chief Liberal Arts Officer's Feelings About the Institution

Feelings About the Institution	Institutional Sponsorship		
	Private Church Related	Private Independent	Public
Not good or fairly good	19.6%	18.8%	25.6%
Very good	63.0%	53.0%	62.4%
Nearly perfect	17.4%	28.2%	12.0%
N	92	149	125

Tau b = -.08, not statistically significant.